

**Summary Report on IDRC @ WUF 2006 Monitoring Activities:**

**Key data and trends**

Prepared by:  
Megan Bradley  
August 2006

## Background

Increasingly, IDRC and its partners are participating in high-level international events that bring together thousands of stakeholders working on development issues in both the South and the North. In the last few years, IDRC has invested significant resources, both monetary and in-kind, to engage in these types of events. Although evaluative thinking has been applied in all of the event-related initiatives supported by IDRC, there has not been a systematic and comprehensive tracking of the benefits, challenges and areas for improvement.

In 2004, IDRC began planning for WUF 3, which took place in Vancouver from 19-23 June 2006. In May 2006, the Special Initiatives Division intern (Megan Bradley) began working with the IDRC WUF Coordination Unit to develop a monitoring plan for IDRC's engagement at WUF and to assist in the collection and collation of data before, during and after the Forum. The initial monitoring plan had to be amended due to reductions in the size of the IDRC delegation to WUF, which made it impossible for the intern to attend WUF.

## Monitoring activities and objectives

The monitoring activities aimed to provide insight into the success of IDRC's efforts before, during and after WUF, in terms of the Centre's key corporate objectives for the Forum. These objectives were:

- (i) to raise awareness of IDRC's profile, in Canada and internationally;
- (ii) to raise awareness of two key urban development issues, urban agriculture and environmental risk management;
- (iii) to support networking and partnership-building opportunities for IDRC partners;
- (iv) to increase the capacity of IDRC partners to communicate the results of their research and participate effectively in international forums.

**The overall objective was to systematically monitor and collect data to inform key outcomes of the IDRC partners @ WUF 2006 program.** Data was collected from IDRC staff, networking event session leaders and speakers, Focus City partners, participants in IDRC events at WUF, visitors to the IDRC booth, and other stakeholders such as coordinators of the urban agriculture tour of Vancouver.

Public Affairs/Communications took primary responsibility for monitoring activities related to the first objective (i), including tracking media pick-up, website traffic, and traffic at the IDRC WUF booth. Under the supervision of Luc Mougeot and Kristina Taboulchanas, Megan Bradley planned and coordinated monitoring activities related to the second (ii), third (iii) and fourth (iv) objectives. These activities were designed and carried out with support from the Evaluation Unit, Communications and UPE. More information on objectives, roles and responsibilities, and methodology is available in the IDRC @ WUF 2006 Monitoring Strategy (9 June 2006).

Key monitoring activities included:

- Media coverage monitoring (carried out by Communications)
- Website traffic monitoring
- Booth traffic monitoring (business card drop, booth monitoring form)
- Networking event factsheets (used to collect basic data on attendance, audience participation, etc.)
- Networking event audience surveys (used to collect data on composition of audience, reactions to the presentations, perceptions of quality of event, etc.)
- De-brief with participants in Growing Cities, Growing Food session
- De-brief with IDRC staff at WUF
- Focus Cities After Action Review (carried out at WUF by UPE staff)
- Evaluation questionnaire for participants in IDRC @ WUF 2006 programme (presenters, Focus City partners, IDRC staff) (used to gather information on strengths and weaknesses of program, directions for improvement)
- Interviews with IDRC partners (session leaders, speakers, tour coordinators, etc.) (carried out in person and by telephone to gather more in-depth information on networking opportunities presented by WUF, perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of IDRC's approach to WUF, avenues for follow-up, etc.)
- IDRC staff After Action Review (interviews carried out with some IDRC staff unable to attend After Action Review) (see appended WUF After Action Review Report)
- Tracer study (to be carried out in November 2006, to examine what influence participation at WUF had on the development of IDRC partners' networks, and on their partnership building activities.)

See the appendices to this report for copies of the data collection instruments.

### **Key data on IDRC's objectives for WUF 2006**

*Objective One: To raise awareness of IDRC's profile, in Canada and internationally.*

Data gathered through several monitoring activities illustrates the progress made in raising awareness of IDRC's profile nationally and internationally.

#### *Media coverage*

IDRC-supported partners and activities at WUF attracted considerable media attention, prompting a Communications staff member to comment that WUF was likely the best large-scale conference IDRC had attended, in terms of meeting the objective of raising the Centre's profile through the media (interview with Kevin Conway). As of 23 June 2006, 24 print articles were published in the national and international press related to IDRC and WUF, in addition to 5 television segments and 7 radio pieces. Nelly Soliman's participation in WUF was also publicized in a national newspaper, and mentioned on local television and radio.

### *Website traffic*

Between August 2005 and the end of July 2006, the WUF page on IDRC's website attracted 129,862 hits, which peaked in June 2006 with 46,162 hits. The site attracted 17,958 unique visitors in this time period, with a peak of 4233 in June 2006.

### *IDRC publications at WUF*

89% of respondents to the Evaluation Questionnaire gave the IDRC publications for WUF a score of 8 or higher (on a scale of 1-10).

### *Networking events*

More than 825 people attended IDRC-supported networking sessions (including the Partnering with the Poor event) and the Growing Cities, Growing Food event at the Earth Village. 60% of participants who completed the audience questionnaire (n=65) indicated that they had heard of IDRC before, 38% were introduced to IDRC at the networking event. Most respondents heard about the networking events through the WUF programme, the WUF-Canada website, or the UN-Habitat website.

### *Visits to IDRC booth at WUF*

More than 70% of Evaluation Questionnaire respondents (n=47) gave the booth set-up/layout a score of 8 or higher (on a scale of 1-10). However, many Evaluation Questionnaire respondents commented that the IDRC booth was not favourably located. 47% of respondents gave the demonstrations a score of 8 or higher. 23% of respondents chose "don't know", which may indicate that the demonstrations could be better publicized to participants in the IDRC conference program.

Although only limited monitoring was possible at the booth, results reflect the diversity of visitors attracted to the IDRC display and demonstrations. IDRC staff at the booth used the monitoring form to record the following information from 93 visitors (percentages are approximate):

<b>Geographic distribution:</b>	
Canada	33%
Africa	24%
Asia and Australia	19%
Latin America and Caribbean	10%
USA	9%
Europe	5%
<b>Occupation/organization:</b>	
Researchers (incl. students)	25%
NGOs and small businesses	22%
National governments (incl. MPs)	13%
Local governments and planners	13%
Media and arts	4%
UN	3%
Unknown	20%

<b>Heard of IDRC before</b>	
Yes	46%
No	53%
No response	1%
<b>Attended other IDRC events at WUF</b>	
Yes	28%
No	58%
No response	14%

46% of those surveyed at the booth had heard of IDRC before, while 53% had not. 28% attended other events at WUF, 58% did not.

73 visitors left business cards at the booth, the details of which reflected comparable diversity in terms of geographic distribution.

*Objective Two: To raise awareness of two key urban development issues, urban agriculture and environmental risk management*

More than 825 attended the five IDRC-supported networking sessions (including the Partnering with the Poor event) and the Growing Cities, Growing Food event at the Earth Village. Approximately 60 people attended the launch of *Growing Better Cities*. These sessions provided the opportunity to share the results of research on two key development issues, urban agriculture and environmental risk management, with a wide range of people.

Information collected through the surveys distributed to participants at the networking events indicates that IDRC's messages regarding urban agriculture and environmental risk management were well-received by the audiences.<sup>1</sup> When asked about the level of interest and usefulness of the presentations, the following responses were received (65 respondents):

*Level of interest*

- ☐ extremely interesting (24) (37%)    ☐ very interesting (27) (42%)  
☐ somewhat interesting (5) (8%)    ☐ not interesting (0) (0%)  
☐ no response (9) (14%)

*Usefulness for my work*

- ☐ extremely useful (13) (20%)    ☐ very useful (23) (35%)  
☐ somewhat useful (16) (25%)    ☐ not useful (0) (0%)  
☐ no response (13) (20%)

When asked about the key messages they were taking away from the panels, the vast majority of audience survey respondents from the urban agriculture sessions identified

---

<sup>1</sup> Note: Surveys were distributed at the following events: Cultivating Inclusive Cities, Growing Better Cities, City Networks and Risk-Proofing Cities.

positive, constructive messages from the events. Participants commented that urban agriculture is “legitimate and practical”, “possible and urgently needed”, and a “workable and smart part of the future for urban sustainability—already!” Others remarked that urban agriculture “innovation in Southern countries is inspiring for North America”, and emphasized the importance of participatory planning, engagement with policymakers, and drawing out the strong economic arguments in support of urban agriculture. A participant from the municipal authority of Malmo, Sweden, commented that Malmo should perhaps develop an urban agriculture policy or strategy.

Follow-up interviews indicated that IDRC’s willingness to work with a Northern city (Vancouver) was instrumental in helping the city’s urban agriculture and food security agenda move forward. Vancouver food security planner Wendy Mendes suggested that policy-makers in the city “pay attention to the signals” given by a respected outside research organization like IDRC showing interest in Vancouver and issues such as urban agriculture. She argued that IDRC’s engagement with the city of Vancouver provided an opportunity to speak with elected officials to build momentum on issues of urban agriculture and food security.

Feedback on the messages taken away from the environmental risk management events was much more limited (fewer surveys were returned by audience members), but generally positive. For example, participants commented on the “strong partnerships in existence” to manage environmental risks, and the “emerging interdependence of cities”. Audience members reflected on the importance of incorporating disaster prevention into urban planning, and the need to involve community members in this process.

*Objective Three: To support networking and partnership-building opportunities for IDRC partners*

Networking and partnership-building opportunities were pursued not only at the Forum, but in the preparation process. For example, the Edible Landscapes project developed its relationship with the City of Montreal throughout the WUF preparation process and gained increasing political support from the city, reflected in a 21 June 2006 press release posted on the Ville de Montreal website.

Many partners particularly valued the opportunity to link Southern cities and Canadian cities such as Halifax and Vancouver. Participants from Halifax and Vancouver indicated that WUF “opened their eyes” to the breadth and depth of work being done on urban agriculture and environmental risk management in the developing world, and indicated that they hope to continue learning more. For various participants interviewed after WUF, the Forum was an opportunity to meet colleagues face-to-face after reading one another’s research or working together electronically for a long time. This opportunity was highly valued by many participants, some of whom indicated that their networking at WUF has already begun to bear fruit. For example, researcher George Matovu has been invited to an Urban Harvest meeting in Mozambique to discuss WUF follow-up, and hopes to develop “mutual synergies” with Kampala city counsellors involved in the FCRI.

The Evaluation Questionnaire asked participants about the benefit of attending WUF in terms of building new networks/contacts. The following answers were given:

	Greatly benefited	Somewhat benefited	Did not benefit	No response
Partners (Non-Focus Cities)	15	2	0	1
Focus Cities Partners	10	4	0	0
IDRC Staff	5	7	1	2
Total	30 (64%)	13 (28%)	1 (2%)	3 (6%)

The Evaluation Questionnaire also asked participants to identify the most important thing they learned or will take home from WUF. The most popular responses amongst panellists and Focus City partners (32 responses) related to networking and partnership-building, and included:

- Exchange of experiences (between cities, particularly Vancouver), learning about new issues (7)
- New partnerships, contacts (6)
- Common challenges between Northern and Southern cities/similarity of urban agriculture challenges and techniques in different cities (5)
- Value of networks (4)

It is important to note, however, that in the more in-depth interviews carried out after WUF, various participants were sceptical about the networking benefits afforded by WUF. While those involved in the “young researchers” panel were very positive about the networking opportunities, others indicated that the schedule was too busy to allow for in-depth conversations with potential partners beyond IDRC-supported speakers, and believed that IDRC missed opportunities to promote “inter-network networking” and strategic links between IDRC partners and other Canadian organizations.

Panellists and Focus City partners who completed the Evaluation Questionnaire indicated that in order to improve networking possibilities at similar events, IDRC could:

- Provide more information and stimulate discussion in advance (7)
- Compile experiences and contacts (3)
- Arrange more interaction, activities between Focus Cities partners (3)
- Support networks (including follow-up, e-conferencing) (2)

*Objective Four: To increase the capacity of IDRC partners to communicate the results of their research and participate effectively in international forums*

Interviews with session leaders and panellists confirmed the strong value partners placed on the Montreal preparatory workshop and the opportunity to work with IDRC to refine the presentations and develop stronger presentational skills. Session leaders were

confident the training received in Montreal improved the quality of the presentations, and when audience members at the networking events were asked through the survey about the quality of the presentations, the following responses were received (65 respondents):

*Quality of presentations*

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> excellent (19) (29%)   | <input type="checkbox"/> very good (22) (34%) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> good (12) (18%)        | <input type="checkbox"/> poor (0) (0%)        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> no response (12) (18%) |   |

While early departure from the Cultivating Inclusive Cities and Growing Better Cities networking events was modest, almost half of the audience left during the course of the City Networks and Urban Risk-Proofing events, perhaps reflecting frustration with limited audience interaction.

The monitoring exercises underlined the importance of approaching capacity-building activities with sensitivity and care in order to avoid conveying the wrong message to IDRC partners. One partner suggested that the extensive attention devoted to preparation, training and rehearsals reflected “insecurity floating in IDRC”, while others emphasized the importance of ensuring that the training did not turn into a “school exercise”. For the most part, however, interviewees reacted positively to the training, with many indicating that it would have positive long-term impacts on their work.

### **Lessons and suggestions raised through monitoring activities**

When asked on the Evaluation Questionnaire to rate the overall experience of WUF on a scale of 1 to 10, the following distribution of answers resulted:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Don't know
					1 (2%)	3 (6%)	24 (51%)	9 (19%)	8 (17%)	2 (4%)

Also on the Evaluation Questionnaire, 46 out of 47 respondents (97.8%) indicated that they would want to participate in an event like WUF again. The most popular reasons offered for wanting to participate again were:

- Opportunity to learn, exchange ideas and contribute to debate (20)
- Networking, meet diverse people and Focus City partners (15)

When respondents were asked on the Evaluation Questionnaire what they liked most about WUF, answers included:

- Networking/meeting partners (including potential future partners for IDRC) (15)
- Networking events (especially on urban agriculture) (10)
- Sharing experiences with other cities (5)
- Diversity of participants and themes (4)

Looking towards future international events, the Evaluation Questionnaire respondents indicated that the following elements would be important to repeat:



- Networking events/presentations and discussions (including events with participation of „beneficiaries’) (13)
- Focus on urban agriculture (7)
- Urban agriculture tour (6)
- Networking (6)
- Booth and demonstrations (4)

The monitoring exercises also indicated where participants were dissatisfied with the experience, and how IDRC might improve its engagement in future events. Evaluation Questionnaire respondents indicated that the following factors were the ones they liked least about WUF:

- Schedule too busy/too many events (11)
- Too many people (including over-crowding in networking sessions) (8)
- Not enough attention to Latin America (including lack of representation and materials in Spanish) (3)
- Changes in location and time of events (2)
- Conflicting sessions (2)
- Lack of strategic meetings with partners, FCRI, other Canadian agencies (2)

The monitoring exercises also produced detailed recommendations for different aspects of IDRC’s engagement in future WUFs and similar international events:

#### General

- Get involved in the planning process (internal and external) well in advance.
  - IDRC should not necessarily wait for external agencies to get organized before instigating the internal planning process. Early organization can enable the Centre to take on a leadership role and potentially influence the agenda of organizations like UN-Habitat.
- Involve high-level IDRC management at very early stages of the planning process when strategic objectives are decided.
- Utilize external contacts (for example, through an external advisory committee) to gather advice and build support for a particular approach to participation in a large-scale meeting such as WUF.
- Start planning for WUF 4 now!
  - Assess which large-scale international events are critical to IDRC several years in advance, and make this information available across the Centre to facilitate advance planning.
- Ensure that the lessons IDRC learned through participation in WUF 3 are passed on to inform the Centre’s engagement in WUF 4 and other similar events.
  - *Before the PAD stage* for upcoming large-scale conferences, bring together WUF 3 organizers and new organizing teams to share lessons.
  - Ask the Evaluation Unit to look at a wide range of large-scale events such as WUF 3 that IDRC has participated in over the course of recent years to systematically examine what IDRC has learned and gained.

### Coordination

- Establish and operationalize key internal coordination roles early in the preparation process.
  - Ensure that the different actors within the Centre (e.g. program, Communications, senior management, GAD) are actively involved in the coordination process from the start, and that the role and responsibilities of “point people” are clear and included in regular team workplans.
- Make sure that roles and relationships with partners are clear from the start.
  - Requests were made beyond contract expectations that were difficult for some partners to meet. In some cases this resulted from different messages coming from IDRC’s Ottawa and Montevideo offices. For future events, ensure that roles are clearly understood, both externally and internally.
- Coordinate with external partners and event managers to ensure that sessions with similar themes are not run at the same time.
- Ensure the Centre does not „crowd’ partners, and that the Centre’s approach is clearly understood by its partners.
  - IDRC’s approach was regarded by some partners as being somewhat overbearing in terms of programmatic direction and media focus. For example, one speaker said he felt the direction for the panel had been set before involving the speakers, although he acknowledged IDRC became more “flexible” as the process unfolded. One session leader reflected that IDRC partners must have a strong and confident relationship with the Centre to ensure that they do not feel smothered, while another questioned IDRC’s drive to gain media attention. IDRC needs to explain to its partners its approach to events like WUF, and its reasons for stressing media coverage.

### GAD and logistics

- As international conferences are particularly labour-intensive events, ensure that more administrative support is available to the coordination team.
- Include money for translation and evaluation in the initial budget.
- Have Spanish contracts prepared and administered by LACRO.
- Consider making travel arrangements as a RAP.
- Streamline points of contact for partners’ travel to a single person within IDRC, and arrange with BTI so that all travel changes must be authorized by a particular IDRC staff member.
  - Consistently apply conditions in contract on travel. (i.e. Partners should not be allowed to change itineraries once they are booked, unless essential.)
- Maintain a master list on the W-drive with all of the participants’ logistical details (e.g. names, contact details, hotel information, itinerary, cost of travel, etc.)
- Budget realistically so that all IDRC staff and partners can stay in one hotel.
- Ensure everyone has a cell phone.
- Rethink the packaging of the IDRC program so that last minute changes can be made easily.

## Programming

- At WUF 4, run fewer events but at a higher level.
  - For example, stage a roundtable or dialogue on the official program, which provides the opportunity to influence UN-Habitat's final report and agenda, as well as their policy networks.
- Maintain a clear programmatic focus on a concrete research topic and avoid over-crowding the conference schedule.
- Given the size of meetings such as WUF, support partners in making strategic decisions about which events to attend, and how to make the most of participation in a large-scale international event.
  - In particular, encourage teams of IDRC partners (e.g. Focus Cities teams) to make strategic decisions about their participation as a group.
- Focus in detail on challenges, rather than simply successes.
  - Encourage more detailed presentations, rather than simply overviews. To enable this, many IDRC partners recommended limiting the number of speakers on a panel to four. It was suggested that in the future a focus on challenges could be achieved by centring presentations on a major challenge and how it was overcome.
- Ensure greater interaction between speakers and the audience.
  - This implies recruiting stronger moderators who will make sure that time limits are respected. It was suggested that greater interaction could be achieved by having the speakers ask the audience questions.
  - Promote events to ensure strong levels of participation, but be sure that event staff manage the number of people coming in to the presentation, so that it is not overcrowded and discussion is still possible.
- Use the WUF as an opportunity to convene programming and monitoring meetings with partners, as well as meetings with other donors.
- Help partners *strategically* network with individuals and organizations beyond those participating in IDRC programs. Maximize the opportunity to introduce partners to other Canadian organizations, and to promote inter-network networking.
- To advance networking and learning opportunities, provide more information in advance on the IDRC partners who will attend the event, and stimulate discussion in advance.
  - Networking opportunities could be further supported by compiling and distributing contact information, as well as by supporting follow-up networking activities such as e-conferencing.
- Continue to support capacity building through preparatory meetings, reviewing presentations and holding rehearsals for the panels.
  - However, it was suggested that next time the preparatory session be held closer to WUF, and that the rehearsals be run a few days before the Forum starts, in order not to detract from the chance to attend sessions and network.
  - The purpose of the training and preparatory sessions should be made clear to participants beforehand. More emphasis should be placed on helping partners formulate messages and be strategic with their presentations. The group-building aspect should be preserved, and efforts should be made to “stay away from turning it into a schooling exercise.”

- Spend more time on the initial information session for IDRC partners and go through details thoroughly.
  - It was also suggested that this session could be beneficially used to provide more political background on WUF and the challenges facing the forum.
- Continue to facilitate activities such as the urban agriculture tour of Vancouver that provide participants with opportunities to learn first hand, in an informal setting, about other cities' policies and experiences.
- Continue supporting an event at the “alternative festivals” such as the WUF Earth Festival that run alongside major international conferences.
  - This is a strategic move for IDRC that enables the Centre to reach a diverse audience. However, it is essential to ensure that the event is thoroughly and accurately promoted.
- Continue to support panels with diverse speakers (geographically, professionally, civil society representatives, project beneficiaries, etc.).
- Support follow-up to WUF by exploring opportunities for collaboration between Northern and Southern cities working on urban agriculture and risk management.
  - In particular, it was suggested that IDRC could facilitate the establishment of partnerships between Canadian cities such as Vancouver, and Southern cities. It would also recommended that IDRC consider supporting distance learning materials for a course on urban agriculture. Case studies on urban agriculture were suggested as particularly useful potential contributions.
- Support the development of peer-reviewed publications on urban agriculture to strengthen its place on the agendas of organizations such as IIED and UN-Habitat.
  - It was suggested that IDRC, in cooperation with other partners, could approach IIED and propose a special edition of *Environment and Urbanization* on urban agriculture for WUF 4.

### Communications

- Ensure a Communications strategy is developed well in advance, with a sharp, simple focus that has the unified support of the conference team. Developing a Communications strategy well in advance would help parcel out tasks more equitably.
- Hold more presentations at the booth, and use the booth as a place to highlight the results of our partners' work.
  - Have an interpretive panel at the booth, and attempt to secure a more prominent place for the booth.
- Continue holding a major reception at large-scale meetings, as this is one of the only times for IDRC partners to meet each other and IDRC's broader networks.
- Create a Communications “check list” to clearly identify what needs to be done within Communications and by whom, in advance of major conferences.
- Explore new communications technologies/media, such as PodCasts, to draw more visitors to the IDRC site and share increased information about events.
- Continue writing “pre-packaged” articles profiling IDRC partners, which can be released quickly from the conference site following brief interviews.
- Ensure IDRC Communications staff have good access to communications equipment on the conference site.

- This could be facilitated by having IDRC staff gain media accreditation.
- Refine the concept of bringing in Southern Focus Cities writers so that there is a clearer sense of what IDRC wants from the writers, and how their material will be used.
- Have Communications recommend the number of publications to ship so that extras are not left over after the event.
- Pitch IDRC stories to foreign media as well as to Canadian outlets.

**Summary report on IDRC @ WUF 2006 Monitoring Activities:**

**Key data and trends**

**APPENDICES**

Appendix A: Event Monitoring Factsheet

Appendix B: Participant Questionnaire (for networking event audience members)

Appendix C: Evaluation Questionnaire (for IDRC partners and staff)

Appendix D: Interview Questions

Appendix E: Booth Monitoring Form

Appendix F: IDRC Staff After Action Review Report

Prepared by:  
Megan Bradley  
August 2006

## APPENDIX A

### **IDRC and Partners @ WUF 2006 Event Monitoring Factsheet**

1. Name of event: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Number of participants at start of event: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Number of participants at end of event: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Number of questions asked: \_\_\_\_\_
5. Information on questions asked:

<b>Who asked the question?</b>	<b>What was the question?</b>	<b>Context</b> (was question informed, indicated confusion, etc.)

6. Were any panellists missing? ☐ Yes ☐ No
7. Was the event on schedule? ☐ Yes ☐ No
8. Were there any technical difficulties? ☐ Yes ☐ No
9. Other comments (press presence, did participants stay to discuss after the event, etc.):  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
10. Team member responsible for completing this form: \_\_\_\_\_

*Please return completed factsheet to Megan Bradley.*

## APPENDIX B

**[IDRC logos, name of session, etc. deleted]**

### Participant Questionnaire

**Give us your views for a chance to win a copy of IDRC's new publication,  
*Growing Better Cities: Urban Agriculture for Sustainable Development!***

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Organization: \_\_\_\_\_  
Email: \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone number: \_\_\_\_\_

I am active in:

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> policymaking   | <input type="checkbox"/> research                 | <input type="checkbox"/> disaster management |
| <input type="checkbox"/> development    | <input type="checkbox"/> advocacy                 | <input type="checkbox"/> urban agriculture   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> urban planning | <input type="checkbox"/> environmental management | <input type="checkbox"/> other: _____        |

In the following areas, I found this event:

*Level of interest*

- ☐ extremely interesting ☐ very interesting ☐ somewhat interesting ☐ not interesting

*Usefulness for my work*

- ☐ extremely useful ☐ very useful ☐ somewhat useful ☐ not useful

*Quality of presentations*

- ☐ excellent ☐ very good ☐ good ☐ poor

I attended this event because: \_\_\_\_\_

The key message I am taking away from this panel is: \_\_\_\_\_

The one aspect of the panel that I found most interesting was: \_\_\_\_\_

I heard about this event through:

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> UN-Habitat website | <input type="checkbox"/> WUF-Canada website | <input type="checkbox"/> IDRC website  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Email lists        | <input type="checkbox"/> IDRC booth         | <input type="checkbox"/> Word of mouth |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____       |   |  |

I had heard of IDRC before attending this event. ☐ Yes ☐ No

Other comments: \_\_\_\_\_

*Winners will be contacted after WUF. Respondents may be contacted for a brief follow-up interview.*



## APPENDIX C

### **IDRC Partners @ WUF 2006—Evaluation Questionnaire**

1.0 The thing I **liked most** about the **WUF 2006** was?

---

---

2.0 The thing I **liked least** about the **WUF 2006** was?

---

---

3.0 On a scale out of 10 (with 10 being the highest score), please rank the following aspects of the **IDRC booth**:

Booth set-up/Layout	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Don't know
Meeting space	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Don't know
Publications	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Don't know
Demonstrations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Don't know
Location	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Don't know

4.0 On a scale out of 10 (with 10 being the highest score), please rank the following **IDRC activities** (if applicable):

IDRC booth/demonstrations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Don't know
Networking events (panels)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Don't know
Gala event	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Don't know
Urban agriculture tour	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Don't know
IDRC's coordination and logistical support	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Don't know

5.0 I ☐ Would / ☐ Would Not want to participate in this type of event again. (Choose one). Why or why not?

---

---

6.0 If IDRC participates in this type of conference again, **what element** would be most important to **repeat**?

---

---

7.0 What should IDRC do differently next time?

---

---

8.0 The most important thing I learned / will take home from WUF 2006 is:

---

---

9.0 Regarding new networks/contacts, I ☐ greatly benefited, ☐ somewhat benefited,  
☐ did not benefit from my presence at WUF 2006.

10.0 To improve my networking possibilities at similar events in the future, IDRC could:

---

---

11.0 On a scale of 1 to 10 (10 being the highest score), my overall experience of WUF  
2006 scores \_\_\_\_\_. Why?

---

---

---

## **APPENDIX D**

### **Interview Questions for IDRC Partners**

#### **Interviews to be conducted at WUF:**

##### *Questions for Session Leaders*

- 1.) What was your objective in coming to the World Urban Forum and leading this session?
- 2.) To what extent did the event meet your objectives?  
Follow-up questions:  
What were the strongest and weakest aspects of the session?  
Did the training provided in Montreal significantly improve the quality of the session?
- 3.) In what ways did IDRC's support help you to meet your objectives? Was IDRC's approach to coordination helpful in your case?
- 4.) What were the most helpful networking opportunities to emerge from the session and the WUF overall?
- 5.) What are your goals following on from the World Urban Forum? If IDRC could help you meet these goals, what type of support would be most beneficial?
- 6.) If you were to work with IDRC on an event like WUF again, what would you want to see changed? What should stay the same?

##### *Questions for General Presenters/Partners*

- 1.) What was your objective in coming to the World Urban Forum and offering your presentation?
- 2.) To what extent were you able to meet your objectives?
- 3.) Did IDRC's support help you to meet your objectives? If so, how?
- 4.) To what extent did the World Urban Forum help you expand your professional network?
- 5.) What are your goals following on from the World Urban Forum? If IDRC could help you meet these goals, what type of support would be most beneficial?
- 6.) In your home city, did your participation in WUF attract any press coverage?
- 7.) If you were to participate in an event like WUF again, what would you want to see changed? What should stay the same?

## **APPENDIX E**

### **IDRC Booth Monitoring Form**

- Country: \_\_\_\_\_
- Occupation/organization: \_\_\_\_\_
- Have you heard of IDRC before? ☐ yes ☐ no
- Have you attended any other IDRC WUF events? ☐ yes ☐ no

- Country: \_\_\_\_\_
- Occupation/organization: \_\_\_\_\_
- Have you heard of IDRC before? ☐ yes ☐ no
- Have you attended any other IDRC WUF events? ☐ yes ☐ no

- Country: \_\_\_\_\_
- Occupation/organization: \_\_\_\_\_
- Have you heard of IDRC before? ☐ yes ☐ no
- Have you attended any other IDRC WUF events? ☐ yes ☐ no

- Country: \_\_\_\_\_
- Occupation/organization: \_\_\_\_\_
- Have you heard of IDRC before? ☐ yes ☐ no
- Have you attended any other IDRC WUF events? ☐ yes ☐ no

- Country: \_\_\_\_\_
- Occupation/organization: \_\_\_\_\_
- Have you heard of IDRC before? ☐ yes ☐ no
- Have you attended any other IDRC WUF events? ☐ yes ☐ no

## APPENDIX F

### World Urban Forum After Action Review

<b>Date of Event:</b>	Thursday 20 July 2006, 9:00-11:30
<b>One or two sentences giving the background / scope to the experience:</b>	For over two years, IDRC has been engaged in preparing for the third World Urban Forum (WUF), which took place in Vancouver from 19-23 June 2006. IDRC had a significant presence at the WUF3, with activities including networking events on urban agriculture and environmental risk management, a reception, book launch, booth demonstrations, and a tour of urban agriculture sites in Vancouver. In addition, IDRC ran a booth, launched and distributed publications created specifically for WUF, participated in two roundtables (donors and researchers), and hosted the new Focus Cities research teams. This After Action Review sought to capture some of the key lessons learned from the wide variety of staff members involved in the WUF, including representatives from UPE, Communications, GAD and the WUF Coordination Unit (SID).
<b>Key Player - individual(s) who called the AAR:</b>	Kristina Taboulchanas
<b>Team Owner of the Learning:</b>	UPE, Communications, GAD
<b>Key Players/AAR Participants</b>	Kristina Taboulchanas, Luc Mougeot, Francine Bouchard, Mark Redwood, Geneviève Lefebvre, Alicia Iglesias, Emma Dany, Sophie Lessard, Hélène St-Martin, Eric Dickson, Marcia Chandra, Jennifer Pepall, Megan Bradley
<b>AAR Facilitator:</b>	Allison Hewlitt (Bellanet), Kristina Taboulchanas, Luc Mougeot, Mark Redwood, Megan Bradley (captured quotes, prepared report)
<b>Key Words: (maximum of 10 that would enable future users to re-find this learning)</b>	World Urban Forum, conferences (planning, logistics, networking), urban agriculture, risk management
<b>Key Dates: (the years that the learning was acquired)</b>	2004-2006

Specific Actionable Suggestions	Quotes
<b>General</b>	
<i>Establish key coordination roles early in the preparation process.</i>	<i>“This really flowed a lot and changed during the process... [we need to] make it very clear so everyone is aware of who to contact.”</i>
<i>Involve high-level IDRC management at very early stages of the planning process when strategic objectives are decided.</i>	<i>“This triggers a process that would be better. In some cases we had to brief our colleagues who were not completely aware of what our strategic objectives were.” “[This] merits more discussion, [especially] corporate objectives and program objectives and how they are aligned.”</i>
<i>Assess which large-scale international events are critical to IDRC several years in advance, and make this information available across the Centre.</i>	
<i>Ask the Evaluation Unit to look at a wide range of large-scale events IDRC has participated in over the course of recent years to capture what IDRC has learned and gained through participating in international conferences.</i>	<i>“This would be great as the event coordinators are still here [at IDRC] ...in some ways, what it comes back to is „is the investment worth it? ” “We could look at program vs. corporate goals, how events are managed, etc.”</i>
<i>Start planning for the next WUF now.</i>	<i>“It’s about deciding on the nature and extent of IDRC’s participation in the next WUF.”</i>
<i>Bring together WUF organizers and new organizing teams at the start of the next large-scale conference project to share lessons.</i>	<i>“This needs to happen BEFORE the PAD stage.”</i>
<i>Include money for translation and evaluation in the initial budget.</i>	
<b>Program planning</b>	

<i>At the next WUF, run fewer events but at a higher level. For example, stage a roundtable or dialogue on the official program, which provides the opportunity to influence UN-Habitat's final report and agenda, as well as their policy networks.</i>	
<i>Maintain a clear programmatic focus on a concrete research topic.</i>	
<i>Include capacity building exercises in the program. Specifically, have exercises that help partners be more strategic in their communications to influence policy.</i>	<i>"There was a big investment in preparatory meetings...it would be valuable to [examine] the costs and benefits associated with having two prep meetings. What were they, and what could be done differently?"</i>
<i>Work in time before and after the WUF (or other large-scale conference) for programming and monitoring meetings with partners. More specifically, tie the annual Focus Cities Learning Forum with WUF4.</i>	
<i>Hold the preparatory workshop for WUF4 with Focus Cities partners well in advance.</i>	<i>"Focus City teams suggested it would be helpful to have a session far in advance of WUF, so that when they get to WUF they know what is going on."</i>
<b><i>Communications</i></b>	
<i>Hold more presentations at the booth, and use the booth as a place to highlight the results of our partners' work.</i>	
<i>Have an interpretive panel at the booth.</i>	
<i>Continue holding a major reception at large-scale meetings, as this is one of the only times for IDRC partners to meet each other and the Centre's broader networks.</i>	<i>"Shut the bar during the speeches [so people can hear the speakers]." "People didn't have name tags, although there were a lot of key people there. This made it easy to take down hierarchies and encourage people to meet one another."</i>
<i>Improve time management within Communications either through (i) having one Communications person 100% dedicated to the project, or (ii) striking a team with clearly defined responsibilities.</i>	<i>"The second model was used by Communications and eventually it worked, but perhaps the first option could be looked at more seriously."</i>

<i>Establish a check list to clearly identify what needs to be done within Communications and by whom, in advance of large conferences.</i>	
<b><i>Logistics and GAD</i></b>	
<i>Spanish contracts should be prepared and administered by LACRO.</i>	<i>“This would save a lot of time. We had to re-do at least three consulting contracting that were done in English.”</i>
<i>Consider making travel arrangements as a RAP.</i>	
<i>Streamline points of contact for partners’ travel to a single person within IDRC.</i>	
<i>Arrange with BTI so that all travel changes must be authorized by a particular IDRC staff member.</i>	
<i>Consistently apply conditions in contract on partners’ travel. (i.e. Partners should not be allowed to change travel itineraries once they are booked.)</i>	
<i>Have a master list posted on the W drive with all the logistical details (e.g. names, contact details, hotel info, itinerary, cost of travel).</i>	
<i>Budget realistically so that everyone can stay in the same hotel.</i>	<i>“As soon as the event date is confirmed, work with the event planner to book hotels. Working with the meeting planner can keep costs down.”</i>

***Areas identified for further discussion and reflection:***

- Preparatory meetings
- Working with partners on logistics (effective communications, planning travel)
- Communications (internal)
- Planning for WUF4 (including programming)
- Assessment and evaluation of participation in large-scale events